Fiscal Note

State of Alaska 2021 Legislative Session

Bill Version: CSSB 14(JUD)

Fiscal Note Number:

(S) Publish Date: 3/5/2021

Identifier: SB14-JUD-AJC-03-1-2021 Department: Judiciary Title: SELECTION AND REVIEW OF JUDGES Appropriation: Judicial Council **SHOWER** Judicial Council Sponsor: Allocation: Requester: Senate Judiciary Committee OMB Component Number: 771

Evnandituras/Pavanuas

Expenditures/Revenues							
Note: Amounts do not include in	oflation unless of		below.			(Thousand	s of Dollars
		Included in					
	FY2022	Governor's					
	Appropriation	FY2022	Out-Year Cost Estimates				
	Requested	Request					
OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2022	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026	FY 2027
Personal Services							
Travel							
Services							
Commodities							
Capital Outlay							
Grants & Benefits							
Miscellaneous							
Total Operating	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		•	.	•			
Fund Source (Operating Only)							
None							
Total	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Positions							
Full-time							
Full-time Part-time							

OI	•	Revenues
Change	ın	REVENIES

None							
Total	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimated SUPPLEMENTAL (FY2021) cost: 0.0 (separate supplemental appropriation required)

Estimated CAPITAL (FY2022) cost: 0.0 (separate capital appropriation required)

Does the bill create or modify a new fund or account? No

(Supplemental/Capital/New Fund - discuss reasons and fund source(s) in analysis section)

ASSOCIATED REGULATIONS

Does the bill direct, or will the bill result in, regulation changes adopted by your agency? No If yes, by what date are the regulations to be adopted, amended or repealed? N/A

Why this fiscal note differs from previous version/comments:

This fiscal note was zeroed out by the Senate Judiciary committee with the intent that the workload be absorbed.

Senator Reinbold (907)465-3822 Prepared By: Phone: Senate Judiciary Committee Date: 03/01/2021

Printed 3/5/2021 Page 1 of 2 Control Code: MGPAg

FISCAL NOTE ANALYSIS

STATE OF ALASKA 2021 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Analysis

The previous fiscal note submitted by the Judicial Council expressed concerns that additional work would have to be done for the following reasons:

- 1. The bill adds magistrates to their work load. Previously, magistrates were appointed by the courts with no screening by the Judicial Council;
- 2. The bill allows the Governor to reject the first round and appoint a second round; and
- 3. The bill adds additional candidates to the mix when the Judicial Council reviews candidates for the bench.

The committee felt that adding six magistrates a year to the workload could be easily absorbed into their existing work load. Magistrates have a much lower bar to clear with vetting, as they generally do much lower level cases and a magistrate does not have to be a lawyer. Reviewing a half dozen extra magistrates a year with this low level a position should not be a difficult or time consuming task.

In fact, the Judicial Council's fiscal note reflected that it anticipates it can absorb the additional work with existing staff. The functions of outreach for additional Governor's candidates can be achieved through coordinating outreach timing so they can all be done in one outreach. The Council did not detail the expenses of investigative costs and background checks. The committee felt that requiring two of the judges being considered nominees of the Governor should not increase the work load, as it is discretionary for the Council to nominate additional judges.

o Page 2 of 2